

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,745		09/20/2001	Marc Birkner	032326-139	7104
21839	7590	11/17/2006		EXAMINER	
	•	ERSOLL & ROON	EY PC		
POST OFF		1404 22313-1404		· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/831,745	BIRKNER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jung Kim	2132		

	(27 OFD 44 27)		2 11 11				
	(37 CFR 41.37)	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Jung Kim	2132				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence a	address			
The Ap	peal Brief filed on <u>24 October 2006</u> is defective	for failure to comply with one or	more provisions	of 37 CFR 41.37.			
1205.0	id dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file an 3) within ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from t ISIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRA	he mailing date of this Notificatio	ate correction (se n, whichever is I	ee MPEP onger.			
1. 🔲	The brief does not contain the items required u heading or in the proper order.	nder 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the iter	ms are not unde	the proper			
2. 🗌	The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).						
3. 🗌	At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).						
4. 🖾	(a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).						
5. 🗌	The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi))						
6. 🛚	The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFI 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).						
7. 🗌	The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).						
8. 🗌	The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal , along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).						
9. 🗌	The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR $41.37(c)(1)(x)$).						
10.	Other (including any explanation in support of	the above items):					
	4. On pg. 4 of the appeal brief, applicant identifies in means for selectively enabling and/or inhibiting state the table 11 (page 11, lines 1-15)." However, it is no corresponds to the controlling means, or to the means.	e transitions" as comprising "the che ot clear if the check engine in combi	ck engine in comb nation with the tab	<u>ination with</u> l <u>e</u>			
	6. Applicant's brief does not contain an argument for Applicant must either present an argument for the reand depending claims. In particular, it appears that 12 are inadequate considering that dependent claim are not under appeal, then the rejections to these claim.	ejections of these claims, or applicar applicant's argument with respect to as 3 and 8 are not addressed. I.e. if t	nt must withdraw the othe rejections of clarity whe rejections of clarity	nese claims claims 1 and aims 3 and 8			

limitations of claims 1 and 12 respectively, then by extension claims 1 and 12 are not patentable under the rejections of claims 3 and 8.

GILBERTO BARRON TO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100